

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-13 and 15-21 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 10 are amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration based on the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. The Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 8-11, 13, 15 and 17-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,974,219 to Fujita in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,701,383 to Russo; and claims 3, 7, 12 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Russo and U.S. Patent No. 6,052,508 to Mincy. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

None of the applied art discloses a system that uses structured representations to index recordings of activity comprising: a moderating device that moderates index recordings and indicates an at least one index has been recorded once the at least one index has begun recording, as recited in claim 1. Similarly, none of the applied art discloses a method of using structured representations to represent recordings of activity, comprising the step of monitoring the at least one index and indicating when the at least one index has begun recording, as recited in claim 10.

Instead, Fujita merely discloses that when a user finds a desirable scene while observing a display of a monitor, the user clicks the mark setting button to set a mark (col. 11, lines 54-61). Similarly, Russo and Mincy fail to disclose the above recited features of amended claims 1 and 10.

Furthermore, the above recited features have significant advantages over the conventional art. For instance, during a meeting with an agenda including a specific number of items a participant may be called out of the meeting, and thus miss items that were on the agenda and recorded. The above discussed features, allow for each item on the agenda to be

"checked" as each item on the agenda comes up for review and is recorded. Following the meeting, the participant can select the agenda items that were missed.

As such, the applied art fails to disclose all of the features of the claimed invention. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 10 are distinguishable over the applied art. Furthermore, claims 2-4 and 6-9, which depend from claim 1, and claims 11-13 and 15-21, which depend from claim 10, are likewise distinguishable over the applied art for at least the reasons discussed above, as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Jude L. Cooney
Registration No. 54,045

JAO:JLC/dap

Date: November 20, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--